

Remarks

Applicants and the undersigned would like to thank the Examiner for her efforts in the examination of this application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

I. Rejection of Claims 1 and 3-6 under 35 USC 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 and 3-6 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ho et al. (US 6,126,330) in view of Mortimer et al. (US 6,091,930).

This rejection is respectfully traversed. First, in Ho, a determination of learning material to present is based solely upon the job currently occupied by the user. There is no teaching to identify a *skill level* as recited in Claim 1, from which to determine a *skill gap*.

Further, Mortimer is directed to a customizable interactive educational system wherein a professor is allowed to “define and create a preferred map or sequence which should be followed during a presentation of the material.” [col. 13, lines 64-66]

Claim 1, on the other hand, is directed to “automatically producing an *individualized* learning sequence . . . for addressing a skill gap . . .” [preamble]. Therefore, Mortimer, in context, does not teach the step of “permitting an administrator to review the at least one mapped course and, if desired, to manually select the at least one mapped course for including in the set of training interventions to be recommended to the user”. In addition, there is no suggestion to combine the teachings of Ho and Mortimer to achieve the present invention as recited in Claim 1.

Therefore, neither are all the elements of Claim 1 found in either of the cited references, nor is the combination thereof believed proper, and thus it is respectfully believed that independent Claim 1, and Claims 3-6 dependent therefrom, patentably define over the cited art.

II. Rejection of Claims 8 and 9 under 35 USC 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 8 and 9 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ho/Mortimer and further in view of Pellegrino et al. (US 6,149,441).

Claims 8 and 9 have been amended to depend from Claim 7, which has been allowed. Therefore, Claims 8 and 9 are also believed allowable.

III. New Claim 10

Claim 10 has been added to more particularly point out that which Applicants regard as their invention. As independent Claim 2 has been canceled, it is believed that no further fees are required for the presentation of an additional independent claim.


No new matter has been added thereby.

Conclusions

Applicants respectfully submit that the above amendments place this application in a condition for allowance, and passage to issue is respectfully solicited. The Applicants and the undersigned would like to again thank the Examiner for her efforts in the examination of this application and for reconsideration of the claims as amended in light

of the arguments presented. If the further prosecution of the application can be facilitated through telephone interview between the Examiner and the undersigned, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at the Examiner's convenience.

Respectfully submitted,



Jacqueline E. Hartt, Ph.D.

Reg. No. 37,845

ALLEN, DYER, DOPPELT, MILBRATH & GILCHRIST, P.A.

255 South Orange Avenue, Suite 1401

P.O. Box 3791


Orlando, Florida 32802

(407) 841-2330

Agent for Applicants

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that the foregoing is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, this 28th day of September, 2004.



Edward Bradley